



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/633,532	08/05/2003	David Reginald Adams	040283-0204	6465
22428	7590	07/12/2005	EXAMINER	
FOLEY AND LARDNER				BALASUBRAMANIAN, VENKATARAMAN
SUITE 500				ART UNIT
3000 K STREET NW				PAPER NUMBER
WASHINGTON, DC 20007				1624

DATE MAILED: 07/12/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/633,532	ADAMS ET AL.
	Examiner Venkataraman Balasubramanian	Art Unit 1624

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 April 2005.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 35-62 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 35-58 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) 59-62 is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date 4/28/05.
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Applicants' response, which included amendment to claim 35, filed on 4/28/2005, is made of record.

Claims 35-62 are pending.

In view of applicants' response, the 112 second paragraph and first paragraph rejections over "prodrug" made in the previous office action have been obviated. However, the following rejections remain.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 53-58 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for treating obesity, does not reasonably provide enablement for treatment all or any disease central nervous system disorders, cardiovascular disorders and gastrointestinal disorders as embraced in the claim language. The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to use the invention commensurate in scope with these claims.

The instant claims 53-58 are drawn to a method of treating disorders of central nervous system, cardiovascular disorders and gastrointestinal disorders which as recited reads on any or all disorders of the said system or organ for which there is no enabling disclosure. The scope of the claims is not adequately enabled solely based on

the activity of the compounds provided in the specification at pages 3 and 18-19. The instant compounds are disclosed have 5-HT₂ receptor activity and it is recited that the instant compounds are useful in treating numerous disorders, for which applicants provide no competent evidence. Reading specification it appears that instant compound is useful for treating all sorts of central nervous system disorders including disorders of the central nervous system, damage to the central nervous system; cardiovascular disorders; gastrointestinal disorders, diabetes insipidus, and sleep apnea, depression, atypical depression, bipolar disorders, anxiety disorders, obsessive-compulsive disorders, social phobias or panic states, sleep disorders, sexual dysfunction, psychoses, schizophrenia, migraine and other conditions associated with cephalic pain or other pain, raised intracranial pressure, epilepsy, personality disorders, age-related behavioural disorders, behavioural disorders associated with dementia, organic mental disorders, mental disorders in childhood, aggressivity, age-related memory disorders, chronic fatigue syndrome, drug and alcohol addiction, obesity, bulimia, anorexia nervosa and premenstrual tension, trauma, stroke, neurodegenerative diseases or toxic or infective CNS diseases for which applicants have not provided competent enablement. Moreover many if not most of central nervous system diseases such as Alzheimer's disease, ALS, multiple sclerosis etc. are very difficult to treat. For multiple sclerosis alone there is no known drug, which can successfully reverse the course of the disease, despite the fact that there are many drugs, which act on serotonin receptor. Even a recent review of 5-HT₂ receptors suggests the use of these ligands still under experimental stage. See Vickers et al., Curr. Opin. Investig. Drugs. 5(9) 377-88,

2004 (PubMed Abstract provided). Note substantiation of utility and its scope is required when utility is "speculative", "sufficiently unusual" or not provided. See *Ex parte Jovanovics*, 211 USPQ 907, 909; *In re Langer* 183 USPQ 288. Also note *Hoffman v. Klaus* 9 USPQ 2d 1657 and *Ex parte Powers* 220 USPQ 925 regarding type of testing needed to support in vivo uses.

Next, applicant's attention is drawn to the Revised Interim Utility and Written Description Guidelines, at 64 FR 71427 and 71440 (December 21, 1999) wherein it is emphasized that 'a claimed invention must have a specific and substantial utility'. The state of the art is indicative of the requirement for undue experimentation. See Vickers et al. cited above.

In evaluating the enablement question, several factors are to be considered. Note *In re Wands*, 8 USPQ2d 1400 and *Ex parte Forman*, 230 USPQ 546. The factors include: 1) The nature of the invention, 2) the state of the prior art, 3) the predictability or lack thereof in the art, 4) the amount of direction or guidance present, 5) the presence or absence of working examples, 6) the breadth of the claims, and 7) the quantity of experimentation needed.

- 1) The nature of the invention: Therapeutic use of the compounds in treating various central nervous disorders related or affected by 5-HT₂ receptor activity.
- 2) The state of the prior art: A very recent publication expressed that the effects of 5-HT₂ activity are still in experimental stage.
- 3) The predictability or lack thereof in the art: Applicants have not provided any competent evidence or disclosed tests that are highly predictive for the pharmaceutical

use for the treatment of all or any central nervous diseases or disorders of the instant compounds. Pharmacological activity in general is a very unpredictable area. Note that in cases involving physiological activity such as the instant case, "the scope of enablement obviously varies inversely with the degree of unpredictability of the factors involved". See *In re Fisher*, 427 F.2d 833, 839, 166 USPQ 18, 24 (CCPA 1970).

- 4) The amount of direction or guidance present and 5) the presence or absence of working examples: Specification has no working examples to show all diseases can be treated based on the test results of 5-HT₂ activity shown in pages 18-19 and the state of the art is that the effects of 5-HT₂ receptor agents are unpredictable.
- 6) The breadth of the claims: The instant claims as recited embrace treatment of any or all central nervous system diseases or disorders.
- 7) The quantity of experimentation needed would be an undue burden to one skilled in the pharmaceutical arts since there is inadequate guidance given to the skilled artisan, regarding the pharmaceutical use, for the reasons stated above.

Thus, factors such as "sufficient working examples", "the level of skill in the art" and "predictability", etc. have been demonstrated to be sufficiently lacking in the instant case for the instant method claims. In view of the breadth of the claims, the chemical nature of the invention, the unpredictability of ligand-receptor interactions in general, and the lack of working examples regarding the activity of the claimed compounds towards 'preventing' the variety of diseases of the instant claims, one having ordinary skill in the art would have to undergo an undue amount of experimentation to use the instantly claimed invention commensurate in scope with the claims.

MPEP 2164.01(a) states, "A conclusion of lack of enablement means that, based on the evidence regarding each of the above factors, the specification, at the time the application was filed, would not have taught one skilled in the art how to make and/or use the full scope of the claimed invention without undue experimentation. In re Wright, 999 F.2d 1557,1562, 27 USPQ2d 1510, 1513 (Fed. Cir. 1993)." That conclusion is clearly justified here. Thus, undue experimentation will be required to make Applicants' invention.

This rejection is same as made in the previous office action. Applicants' traversal to over come this rejection is not persuasive.

First of all, the references cited I by the applicants do not teach or suggest any or all diseases can be treated as embraced in the claim language. Instant claims are reach through claims. That is based on the mode of action, applicants are urging that any or all diseases could be treated with the instant compounds for which there is no support.

Secondly, even in these references some compound are shown to treat some diseases or disorders. There is no evidence in these references that a single class of compound because of its mode of action can be used treat any or all disease generically embraced in the claim language.

Thirdly, the references do not lend support to applicants' assertion that treating one disorder or disease would provide objective enablement for any or all genus of disorders or diseases. There is no evident presented in these references that any or all central nervous disorders, cardiovascular disorders, gastrointestinal disorders etc. could be treated with a single class of compound .

Hence, this rejection is proper and is maintained.

Showing of enablement for specific disease or disorder is needed to obviate this rejection.

Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 35-52 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-17 of copending Application No. 10/685,799. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the compounds embraced in the instant claims 35-52 overlap with genus of compounds of claims 1-17 of the copending application 10/685,799.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Applicants' should note that although a restriction was made in the parent and the heterocore bearing X₁, X₂, X₃ and X₄ are deemed as distinct and independent, the

Art Unit: 1624

double patenting is proper, as applicants have not limited the scope of the copending application to exclude azapyrazinoindole. However, if the instant application is found allowable before the copending application 10/685,799, the double patenting rejection will be withdrawn and will be applied to the copending application.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 59-62 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication from the examiner should be addressed to Venkataraman Balasubramanian (Bala) whose telephone number is (571) 272-0662. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday from

8.00 AM to 6.00 PM. The Acting Supervisory Patent Examiner (SPE) of the art unit 1624 is James O. Wilson, whose telephone number is 571-272-0661.

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned (703) 872-9306. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (571) 272-1600.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAG. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-2 17-9197 (toll-free).

Venkataraman Balasubramanian
Venkataraman Balasubramanian

7/7/2005